

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15-18 are pending in this application, Claims 1, 12, and 15 having been currently amended; and Claims 16-18 having been added. Support for amended Claims 1, 12, and 15, and new Claims 16-18 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and the specification as originally filed.<sup>1</sup> No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645; hereinafter “Moteki”) in view of Schneider et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0192049; hereinafter “Schneider”) and Wako (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,094).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Khatib for granting an interview with Applicants’ representative on February 4, 2011, during which time the issues in the outstanding Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized hereinafter and also on the Interview Summary sheet. During the interview, a proposed amendment was discussed in which Claim 1 would recite that “a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and a second display bar is displayed on the display and includes video control information that is used to control said video content.” Examiner Khatib indicated that this amendment would likely overcome the cited references, but stated that he would have to further consider the amendment upon submission of a formal response. In light of the Examiner’s indication, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to include the proposed amendments discussed with the Examiner during the interview.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Figures 14 and 15.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki in view of Schneider and Wako, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 12 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus configured to display at least a map relating to navigation, and video content from a plurality of sources including, *inter alia*:

...a display configured

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to a display of video content, when a source operator for switching said sources is operated;

to sequentially and cyclically switch, when displaying said video content, between playback target sources of said plurality of sources, when said source operator is operated;

to switch, when displaying said video content, the display of said video content to the display of said map, when a map operator for instructing displaying of said map is operated; and

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to the display of said video content, when said map operator is operated,

wherein *a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and a second display bar is displayed on the display and includes video control information that is used to control said video content*, and

*the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively*; and

a setting unit configured to set one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said map or one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said video content in a dual screen display, and to accept a size from said plurality of sizes of the region for displaying said video content for each of said sources,

wherein the display is configured to form said dual screen display based on a setting corresponding to each source.

Independent Claim 12 recites substantially similar features as independent Claim 1.

Thus, the arguments presented below with respect to independent Claim 1 are also applicable to independent Claim 12.

As acknowledged at page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Moteki fails to explicitly disclose “a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and ***a second display bar is displayed on the display and includes video control information that is used to control said video content,***” and “the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively.” In an attempt to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Moteki, pages 4 and 5 of the outstanding Office Action cites Schneider.

Applicants respectfully submit that Schneider fails to teach or suggest “the first display bar and the second display bar are ***displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge*** of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are ***displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge*** of the display, respectively,” as recited in Claim 1.

During the interview, the Examiner stated that he is interpreting the supplemental channels 170 and 180 to be equivalent to Applicants’ first and second display bars. Paragraph [0057] of Schneider describes that “A user of the narration interface may interact with the interface by selecting a particular content channel. When selected, each content channel presents information regarding the content channels video segment through the supplemental channels.” Thus, paragraph [0057] of Schneider describes that the

supplemental channels show information about the content in the content channels.

Paragraph [0062] of Schneider also describes that the supplementary channels can be used to provide media or information in some other form regarding the selected channel. However, even assuming, *arguendo*, that a supplementary channel corresponds to Applicants' second display bar, Schneider fails to describe that the supplementary channel ***includes video control information that is used to control said video content***. The supplementary channel merely displays information. In addition, as shown in Figure 1 of Schneider, the supplemental channels 170 and 180 are not displayed along an entire lower or upper edge, as the supplemental channels 170 and 180 do not extend all the way across the display screen in Figure 1. Figure 9 of Schneider shows possible layouts of the content channels, but clearly does not show a control bar displayed along an entire lower or upper edge of the display.

Turning now to Wako, page 5 of the outstanding Office Action asserts that Figure 1B of Wako shows first and second display bars "along an entire lower edge and upper edge." Figure 1B of Wako shows map information along an entire upper edge and lower edge, however, Wako does not show a display bar, that includes video control information that is used to control the video content, displayed along an entire lower or upper edge. Thus, as Schneider fails to show a display bar containing video control information displayed along an entire lower or upper edge, and Wako also is silent to this feature, even if these references are properly combined, the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of Claim 1. Namely, the feature of "the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively."

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 12 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguish over Moteki in view of Schneider and Wako.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki in view of Schneider and Wako be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)

Derek P. Benke  
Registration No. 56,944